

mons hated it but dared not publicly oppose it, Macaulay makes a feeling reference to the troublesomeness and expense of a contested election in his own days.

The near prospect of a dissolution could not be very agreeable to a member whose election was likely to be contested. He must go through all the miseries of a canvass, must shake hands with crowds of freeholders or freemen, must ask after their wives and children, must hire conveyances for outvoters, must open alehouses, must provide mountains of beef, must set rivers of ale running, and might perhaps, after all the drudgery and all the expense, after being lampooned, hustled, pelted, find himself at the bottom of the poll, see his antagonists chaired, and sink half ruined into obscurity.¹

Still more interesting to the reader of to-day is Macaulay's discussion of the question, when the House of Lords can successfully resist the will of the House of Commons.²

These modern instances, directly or indirectly suggested, are so well employed that the reader does not feel that they are dragged in—they really elucidate the point at issue, and they make the reader feel that the questions these bygone statesmen were disputing about were much the same kind of problems as those which parties were fighting about in 1857. They give a singularly practical and concrete character to the History.

Besides this, there are examples and references drawn

from every time to illustrate an argument or
add interest
to a fact mentioned. Sometimes they are
quite modern.
In describing the troops of William at the
battle of the
Boyne, Macaulay contrives to introduce an
allusion to the
Crimean War. Amongst William's troops, he
says, there
came ' from the neighbourhood of Lough
Erne a regiment

¹ V, 2297 (xix).

² VI, 2974-5 (xxv).